



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09 831,047	05 03 2001	Magdalena Blaszczyk-Thurin	WST93AUSA	8220
270	7590	06 16 2003		
HOWSON AND HOWSON ONE SPRING HOUSE CORPORATION CENTER BOX 457 321 NORRISTOWN ROAD SPRING HOUSE, PA 19477			EXAMINER SNEDDEN, SHERIDAN	
			ART UNIT 1653	PAPER NUMBER
			DATE MAILED: 06 16 2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/831,047	BLASZCZYK-THURIN, MAGDALENA
	Examiner Sheridan K Snedden	Art Unit 1653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-43 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-9, drawn to a peptide mimetic of a carbohydrate ligand to an adhesion molecule.

Group II, claim(s) 10-16, drawn to a method of modulating the binding of an adhesion molecule.

Group III, claim(s) 17-21, drawn to a method of treating cancer.

Group IV, claim(s) 22-24, drawn to a method of inhibiting an inflammatory response.

Group V, claim(s) 25-29, drawn to a method of identifying a peptido-mimetic of a carbohydrate ligand that affects binding.

Group VI, claim(s) 30-35, drawn to a method of identifying a peptido-mimetic that affects angiogenesis.

Group VII, claim(s) 36-40, drawn to a method of identifying a peptido-mimetic that reduces the inflammatory process.

Group VIII, claim(s) 41, drawn to a method of making a peptido-mimetic.

2. Upon thorough consideration of the claims, the examiner has determined that a lack of unity of invention exists, as defined in Rule 13.

PCT Rule 13.2 states that unity of invention referred to in Rule 13.1 shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the

Art Unit: 1653

same or corresponding special technical features. Annex B, Part 1(b), indicates that "special technical features" means those technical features which as a whole define a contribution over the prior art. The inventions listed as Groups I-VIII are directed to products and methods that share the common special technical feature of a carbohydrate ligand to an adhesion molecule. This common special technical feature is not a contribution over the prior art as it is taught by Polley *et al.*. Thus the invention of Groups I-VIII lack unity of invention.

3. Annex B, Part 1(f) indicates the "Markush practice" of alternatives in a single claim. Part 1(f(i)) indicates the technical interrelationship and the same or corresponding special technical feature is considered to be met when: (A) all alternatives have a common property or activity, and (B) a common structure is present or all alternatives belong to a recognized class of chemical compounds. Further defining (B) in Annex B, Part 1(f)(i-iii), the common structure must; a) occupy a large portion of their structure, or b) the common structure constitutes a structurally distinctive portion, or c) where the structures are equivalent and therefore a recognized class of chemical compounds, each member could be substituted for one another with the same intended result. That is, with a common or equivalent structure, there is an expectation from knowledge in the art that all members will behave in the same way. Thus, the technical relationship and the corresponding special technical feature result from a common (or equivalent) structure which is responsible for the common activity (or property). Part 1(f(iv)) indicates that when all alternatives of a Markush grouping can be differently classified, it shall not, taken alone, be considered justification for finding a lack of unity. Part 1(f(v)) indicates that when dealing with alternatives, it can be shown that at least one Markush alternative is not novel over the prior art,

the question of unity of invention shall be reconsidered, but does not imply that an objection shall be raised.

With regards to the “Markush Alternatives” listed in claim 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, the common technical feature is Lewis antigen; however, all alternative Lewis antigens do not share a common structure. In addition, the alternative Lewis antigens listed in claim 4 and 5 are not novel over the prior art, *e.g.* Polley *et al.*. As such, when an election is made to the claims of Group I or VIII, an additional election is required as to the elected formula for the Lewis antigen (regarding claims 4 and 5) and elected peptide sequence (regarding claims 6-8).

Advisory Information

4. A telephone call was made to Mary Bak on June 13, 2003 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1653

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheridan K Snedden whose telephone number is (703) 305-4843. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low can be reached on (703) 308-2923. The fax phone number for regular communications to the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-3975.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

SKS
June 15, 2003

SKS

Christopher S. F. Low
CHRISTOPHER S F LOW
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600